

Abstract: This paper deals with two textual problems in Martial 2.7. At vv. 1 and 5 most editors print the name *Atticus*, while Shackleton Bailey recently favours *Attalus*. The former has stronger elements on his side: not only it is better transmitted (by the first family and the *excerpta Frisingensia*, a XIth century anthology; also the Gennadian edition shows traces of this name), but *Attalus* could have been interpolated from 1.79.1, where not only the same name occurs, but also an almost identical *clausula* (1.79.1 *semper agis causas et res agis, Attale, semper* ~ 2.7.1 *Declamas belle, causas agis, Attice [Attale], belle*). At v. 7 all modern editors print *Nil bene cum facias, facias tamen omnia belle* with the *exc. Fris.*, while second and third family have the ametrical *Nil bene cum facias, facis tamen omnia belle*. The vulgate text however is far from convincing: the syntax is very strange (*tamen* is always in the main clause) and the punctuation also raises doubts. I propose to read: *Nil bene cum facias, facis (haec) tamen omnia belle*, a text transmitted by ms. *G* and by another ms. mentioned by Scriverius. The omission is very easy and occurs often in Martial's transmission. The verse resembles much Ovid, *met.* 14.121 *et dare plangorem: facit haec tamen omnia seque* (this may be due to intentional allusion or to reminiscence). Moreover, imitation of Martial's verse by the carolingian poet Theodulf of Orléans, *carm.* 6.1 *Nil horum fixe geris, haec tamen omnia fecte* shows that he read 2.7.7 in the form proposed.

Keywords: Martial, Medieval transmission, Theodulf of Orléans, Reception, Textual criticism.